

REMARKS

In the **non-final** Office Action mailed November 19, 2010 the Office noted that claims 3, 6, 8, 11-13 and 15-17 were pending and rejected claims 3, 6, 8, 11-13 and 15-17. In this amendment claim 16 has been amended, no claims have been canceled, claim 18 is new, and, thus, in view of the foregoing claims 3, 6, 8, 11-13 and 15-18 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Office's rejections and objections are traversed below.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee, U.S. Patent No. 5,923,759. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument and amendment.

The Applicants have amended claim 16 to recite "second input-output means for receiving preliminary data, **said second input-output means separate from said first input-output means.**" (Emphasis added) Support for the amendment may be found, for example, in page 10, lines 31-35, wherein it discusses a second input-output port (thus a further port) and the fact that "the input-output means 14 [is in this case] reserved for the transfer of the digital data." The Applicants submit that no new matter is

believed to have been added by the amendment of claim 16.

On page 2 in the *Response to Arguments* it is asserted that "an interface card on a host can be read to include a microcircuit card." As such it appears that the Office considers that interfaces 132, 134, 136 of Lee are implemented as interface cards, which cards are encompassed by the claimed wording (microcircuit card).

Applicants respectfully disagree that Lee teaches or suggests that interfaces 132, 134, 136 are cards. Nothing in Lee can be found to support the assertion of the Office in this respect.

The connection of interfaces 132, 134, 136 to bus 140 via a UART link (i.e. a serial link) seems to the opposite suggestive of interface modules, not cards.

Further, even assuming *arguendo* that the smart card interfaces may be equated to the claimed smart cards, it cannot be asserted that these interfaces include the claimed "stream control means".

This is because, in the allegedly anticipating stream control means (col. 7, l. 17-34), either the tested smart card (in a smart card unit) or processor 122 performs an authentication. It cannot therefore be asserted that the element equated to the stream control means in Lee is included in any smart card interface.

As such, Lee fails to anticipate the claimed device of

claim 16.

For at least the reasons discussed above, claim 16 and the claims dependent therefrom are not anticipated by Lee.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3, 6, 8, 11-13, 15 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Lee in view of Pyle, U.S. Patent No. 5,737,231. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument.

Pyle adds nothing to the deficiencies of Lee as applied against the independent claims. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, Lee and Pyle, taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious claims 3, 6, 8, 11-13, 15 and 17.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIM

Claim 18 is new. Support for claim 18 is found, for example, in ¶ 0049 of the printed publication version of the Specification. The Applicants submit that no new matter is believed to have been added by the addition of the claim. The prior art of record fails to disclose wherein said second input-output means uses an ISO 7816 protocol.

SUMMARY

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103. It is also submitted that claims 3, 6, 8, 11-13 and 15-18 continue to be allowable. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

/James J. Livingston, Jr./
James J. Livingston, Jr.
Reg. No. 55,394
209 Madison St, Suite 500
Alexandria, VA 22314
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573
(703) 979-4709

JJL/fb